



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,520	03/16/2004	Eric Leopold	MICRU:68082	3981
24201	7590	05/27/2009		
FULWIDER PATTON LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6060 CENTER DRIVE, TENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			EXAMINER RYCKMAN, MELISSA K	
			ART UNIT 3773	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/27/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/802,520

Applicant(s)

LEOPOLD ET AL.

Examiner

MELISSA RYCKMAN

Art Unit

3773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2/25/09.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 2/25/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The originally filed application did not include "the tubular member configured to allow the distal end of the hollow, elongated member *to be pulled off* the flexible pusher member."

Claim Objections

Claim 24 states "a longitudinal slot formed one wall", this should be corrected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Diaz as a matter of design choice and further in view of Ahmed (5,293,713).

Diaz teaches a device comprising the following:

- A sheath (12) in combination with a vasoocclusive device (50)
- the vasoocclusive device including an assembly of a flexible pusher member (44) having a distal end and an embolic coil (50) at the distal end of the flexible pusher member configured for use in interventional therapy and vascular surgery, the flexible pusher member having an unused segment the sheath comprising:
 - a hollow, elongated tubular member (12), having a distal end, opposing upper and lower walls,
 - opposing side walls (12)
 - a longitudinal interior channel (14)
 - a longitudinal slot (36/34) formed one wall of the elongated tubular member and extending a majority of the length of elongated tubular member (para. 42), a

segment of the upper wall of the elongated tubular member configured to allow the distal end of the hollow, elongated tubular member to be pulled off the flexible pusher member (capable of being pulled off), a proximal segment of the corresponding wall of the elongated tubular member being without a slot (a *segment* is without a slot) having opposing sides with inner side surfaces extending through the upper wall of the elongated tubular member leading to the interior channel (12) permitting introduction of the pusher member (44, Fig. 5) into the interior channel removal of the sheath from the pusher member (Fig. 5), the segment of the elongated tubular member without a slot remaining attached to the unused segment of the flexible pusher member to facilitate initiation of loading of the flexible pusher member into the sheath (Fig. 5)

- wherein the outside diameter is approximately .003 inches, and wherein the inside diameter is slightly greater than that of a deployment catheter (Page 4, paragraph 42), corresponding to the lower wall of the hollow, elongated tubular member (12) being about 0.002 to 0.004 inches thick to allow the opposing sides of the slot of the hollow, elongated tubular member to flex outwardly to allow the slot to open to accept the vasoocclusive device (Page 2, paragraph 14).
- wherein the hollow, elongated tubular member is formed from a polymer material with a durometer in the range of about 50D and 70D (page 4, paragraph 42). High-density polyethylene is a type of thermoplastic polymer and has a durometer of between 61D and 63D, falling in the disclosed range.

Diaz fails to teach a v-shape configured guide. However, Ahmed teaches the use of angled winged flanges in order to enhance guiding the element as the element is pushed through the opening (Col. 2 lines 68-70). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Diaz with the winged flanges as taught by Ahmed in order to enhance guiding the element as the element is pushed through the opening.

Ahmed fails to disclose the size of the interior angle between the wings, however, Ahmed does disclose that it should be at least thirty degrees, and further the angle used is sufficient to perform the function of a guide as illustrated in figure 2. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the angles of the opening between 110 to 150 degrees, a working range as disclosed by the applicant, since the device as disclosed by Ahmed performs equally well as a guide without a specific angle range. Further, it has been held that where the general condition of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 24-30 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,171,623. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because all elements of the current application are claimed in application '223.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 2/25/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant generally argues the following:

- Diaz does not have an elongated tubular member configured to allow the distal end of the hollow, elongated tubular member to be pulled off the flexible pusher member

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. The elongated tubular member is capable of being pulled off the flexible pusher member, Diaz teaches the structural limitations as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MELISSA RYCKMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-9969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571)-272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MKR
/Melissa Ryckman/
Examiner, Art Unit 3773

/(Jackie) Tan-Uyen T. Ho/

Application/Control Number: 10/802,520

Page 8

Art Unit: 3773

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3773